

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 26-37 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, 26 and 29 are independent claims.

By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 17, 26 and 29 are amended.

No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 and 26-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0156923 to Tanimoto in view of JP-A-2002-091856 to Shigeru and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,597,307 to Redford. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

I. Independent Claims 1, 17, 26 And 29

The previous Amendment added new features into the independent claims. For example, claim 1 recited "wherein the first circuit is configured to activate in response to insertion of the portable operation member into the opening of the interface unit, and the second circuit is configured to activate in response to a mechanical operation of the portable operation member while the portable operation member is inserted in the opening of the interface unit." Claims 17, 26 and 29 recited similar features.

The Office Action does not dispute that Tanimoto and Shigeru do not disclose or render obvious the additional features recited in the independent claims. However, the Office Action asserts that Redford cures the deficiencies of Tanimoto. The Office Action assertion is incorrect for at least the following two reasons.

First, Redford does not disclose the features added to the independent claims. The Office Action asserts, at page 3, the first paragraph and page 7, the third paragraph, that Redford discloses activating the first circuit and the second circuit at col. 3, lines 15-28; col. 8, lines 11-28; col. 10, lines 55-67; col. 19, lines 9-14; and col. 21, lines 57-64. However, the cited portions of Redford disclose two alternative embodiments. The first

embodiment is directed to a remote controller, while the second, alternative embodiment relates to a removable media storage. The removable media storage and the remote controller perform the same function, and are not embodied together to perform different functions. Also, the Office Action fails to establish that Redford suggests combining these two alternative embodiments so that the remote controller and the removable media storage perform separate functions, such as activating different circuits. Thus, even if combined, Redford does not cure the deficiencies of Tanimoto and Shigeru.

Second, one of ordinary skill would not have had a reasonable rationale to combine Redford with Tanimoto and Shigeru. In particular, Shigeru discloses inserting an IC card and performing functions by accessing a touch panel. The touch panel is separate from the IC card. In other words, while the IC card is used for insertion, the touch panel is used for mechanical operation. The mechanical operation is not operated on the IC card. On the other hand, the Office Action appears to assert that Redford's removable media storage is both inserted into a host device and mechanically operated upon. In other words, the Office Action appears to assert that the subject that is inserted into the host device and the subject that is mechanically operated upon are the same subject, the removable media storage. However, this conflicts with what is required in Shigeru, in which the subject that is inserted (the IC card) and the subject that is mechanically operated upon (the touch panel) are separate and different subjects. Thus, one of ordinary skill would not have had any reasonable rationale to combine Redford with Shigeru to cure the deficiencies of Tanimoto.

II. Dependent Claim 30

Regarding dependent claim 30, the Office Action asserts that Shigeru discloses "depression." However, what is recited in claim 30 is that "the mechanical operation of the portable operation member includes a depression of the portable operation member by the user." This requires that the depression is a specific type of mechanical operation of the

portable operation member. The portable operation member, as defined in claim 1, is used for the insertion. As discussed above, in Shigeru, the IC card is used for insertion but not for mechanical operation. The touch panel is used for mechanical operation but not for insertion. That is, Shigeru does not disclose a "portable operation member" that is used for both insertion and mechanical operation. Therefore, Shigeru does not disclose the "depression" as defined in claim 30.

III. Dependent Claims 34-37

Regarding claims 34-37 that were added in the previous Amendment, the Office Action asserts that Redford discloses "where the operation detecting unit is part of the portable operation member" at col. 21, lines 57-64; col. 22, lines 32-45; and col. 25, lines 41-50. However, the cited portions of Redford do not disclose the features recited in claims 34-37. In particular, the cited portions of Redford appear to only disclose that, in an autostart process, the existence of a removable media storage is detected by a host device. These portions of Redford do not disclose an operation detecting unit that is part of the removable media, which is asserted as the portable operation member.

IV. Current Claim Amendments

To expedite allowance, the independent claims are amended herein for further clarity. For example, claim 1 is amended to clarify that (i) the portable operation member mechanically operated to activate the second circuit is the same as the portable operation member being inserted in the opening, and (ii) the portable operation member is kept inserted in the opening when a mechanical operation to activate the second circuit is made (i.e., the insertion of the portable operation member is not temporary). The other independent claims are similarly amended.

Independent claims 1, 17, 26 and 29, as amended, further distinguish from the disclosure of the applied references.

V. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, claims 1, 17, 26 and 29 are patentable over the applied references. Dependent claims 30 and 34-37 are also patentable over the applied references, as discussed above. The other dependent claims are also patentable at least in view of the patentability of claims 1, 17, 26 and 29, from which they depend, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 and 26-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-17 and 26-37 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/kjb

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 28, 2011

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--